



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/549,250

05/18/2006

Carlos Garcia-Echeverria

ON/4-32910A

2465

75074

7590

01/28/2009

NOVARTIS INSTITUTES FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, INC.
400 TECHNOLOGY SQUARE
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

EXAMINER

RAO, DEEPAK R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/28/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/549,250	Applicant(s) GARCIA-ECHEVERRIA ET AL.	
	Examiner Deepak Rao	Art Unit 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20060913</u> . | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>PTO-Notice to Comply with Sequence Disclosure</u> . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-11 and 13-22 are pending in this application.

Specification

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth below or on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures. Particularly, see experimental data in specification page 156, which contains sequences. (See attached notice to comply).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a composition comprising a compound of formula (I) and a pharmaceutically acceptable diluent or carrier; and a method of treating breast tumor comprising the step of administering a compound of formula (I), does not reasonably provide enablement for a composition comprising a therapeutically effective amount of a compound of formula (I) and a further drug substance (claim 13); or a method for treatment of neoplastic diseases and immune

Art Unit: 1624

system disorders generally; or a method for the treatment or prevention of a disease which responds to inhibition of focal adhesion kinase and/or IGF-1R; or a method for the treatment or prevention of inflammatory and/or an immune disorder. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed. The determination that “undue experimentation” would have been needed to make and use the claimed invention is not a single, simple factual determination. Rather, it is a conclusion reached by weighing all the above noted factual considerations.

The instant claim 13 is drawn to ‘a composition comprising a compound of formula (I) and additionally a further drug substance’ and the specification at page 23 provides some explanation of the ‘other drugs’ intended by the claim, however, the scope of the claim includes therapeutic agents that are known and those that may be discovered in future, for which there is no enablement. Further, the entire scope of the therapeutic activity intended for the compounds of the invention is not enabled for the reasons provided below.

The instant claims 14-22 are drawn to 'a method for treatment of neoplastic diseases and immune system disorders generally; or a method for the treatment or prevention of a disease which responds to inhibition of focal adhesion kinase and/or IGF-1R; or a method for the

Art Unit: 1624

treatment or prevention of inflammatory and/or an immune disorder'. The examples in pages 155-162 in the specification provide *in vitro* assays to measure the FAK and ZAP-70 kinase activity of some of the exemplified compounds of the instant invention. The instant claims appear to be 'reach through' claims. Reach through claims, in general have a format drawn to mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality and thereby reach through any or all diseases, disorders or conditions, for which they lack written description and enabling disclosure in the specification thereby requiring undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to practice the invention.

The testing assays provided in the specification on pages 155-162 are related to FAK and ZAP-70 kinase inhibition in a standard coupled enzyme assay using 4T1 breast carcinoma cell line and biological results (in terms of IC50) of some of the tested compounds is provided in pages 164-170. Applicant did not state on record or provide any guidance that the assay provided is correlated to the clinical efficacy of the treatment of various disorders of the claims. As can be seen from specification page 20, the activity data holds significant role in determining the dosage regimen based on the minimal effective concentration of each of the compound to achieve the desired inhibition of the kinases.

The instant claims are drawn to "a method for treatment of neoplastic diseases and immune system disorders generally; or a method for the treatment or prevention of a disease which responds to inhibition of focal adhesion kinase and/or IGF-1R; or a method for the treatment or prevention of inflammatory and/or an immune disorder". The use disclosed in the specification is as SYK and ZAP-70 kinase inhibitors, useful to treat a large list of diverse diseases, some of which are listed in pages 16-17 and 24-25. Test assays and procedures are

Art Unit: 1624

provided in the specification in pages 155162 related to FAK and ZAP-70 kinase inhibition and it was concluded that the compounds of the invention exhibit inhibitory activity, however, there is nothing in the disclosure regarding how this *in vitro* data correlates to the treatment of the diverse disorders of the instant claims. The diseases and disorders encompassed by the instant claims include various types of tumors, CNS diseases, infectious diseases, autoimmune diseases, etc., some of which have been proven to be extremely difficult to treat. Further, there is no reasonable basis for assuming that the myriad of compounds embraced by the claims will all share the same physiological properties since they are so structurally dissimilar as to be chemically non-equivalent and there is no basis in the prior art for assuming the same. Note *In re Surrey*, 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group.

Further, there is no disclosure regarding how all these assorted types diseases are treated. See MPEP § 2164.03 for enablement requirements in cases directed to structure-specific arts such as the pharmaceutical art. Receptor activity is generally unpredictable and highly structure specific area, as evidenced by the wide range of results obtained for the tested compounds. It is inconceivable as to how the claimed compounds can treat the large list of diseases embraced by the claims having diverse mechanisms.

For example, the instant claims are drawn to ‘treating or **preventing** various types of tumors’ which includes treatment of all types of cancers of blood, lymphocytes, etc. A ‘cancer’ is anything that causes abnormal tissue growth. That can be growth by cellular proliferation more rapidly than normal, or continued growth after the stimulus that initiated the new growth has ceased, or lack (partial or complete) of structural organization and/or coordination with surrounding tissue. It can be benign or malignant. Thus, such term covers not only all cancers,

Art Unit: 1624

but also covers precancerous conditions such as lumps, lesions, polyps, etc. No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a “silver bullet” is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states that “each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study” (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Also see *In re Buting*, 163 USPQ 689 (CCPA 1969), wherein ‘evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer, was held insufficient to establish the utility of the claims directed to disparate types of cancers’. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally. In reference to cancer treatment using protein tyrosine kinase inhibitors, Traxler (Exp. Opin. Ther. Patents, 1997) stated that “pharmacological properties such as stability in biological media, bioavailability, metabolism or formulability are significant hurdles” see page 585, col. 2, lines 33-36.

Enablement for the scope of "treatment or prevention of inflammatory disorders" generally is not present. For a compound or genus to be effective against inflammation generally is contrary to medical science. Inflammation is a process, which can take place individually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There is no common mechanism by which all, or even most, inflammations arise. Mediators include bradykinin, serotonin, C3a, C5a, histamine, assorted leukotrienes and cytokines, and many, many others. Accordingly,

Art Unit: 1624

treatments for inflammation are normally tailored to the particular type of inflammation present, as there is no, and there can be no "magic bullet" against inflammation generally. Inflammation is the reaction of vascularized tissue to local injury; it is the name given to the stereotyped ways tissues respond to noxious stimuli. These occur in two fundamentally different types. Acute inflammation is the response to recent or continuing injury. The principal features are dilatation and leaking of vessels, and recruitment of circulating neutrophils. Chronic inflammation or "late-phase inflammation" is a response to prolonged problems, orchestrated by T-helper lymphocytes. It may feature recruitment and activation of T- and B-lymphocytes, macrophages, eosinophils, and/or fibroblasts. The hallmark of chronic inflammation is infiltration of tissue with mononuclear inflammatory cells. Granulomas are seen in certain chronic inflammation situations. They are clusters of macrophages, which have stuck tightly together, typically to wall something off. Granulomas can form with foreign bodies such as aspirated food, toxocara, silicone injections, and splinters. Otitis media is an inflammation of the lining of the middle ear and is commonly caused by *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and *Haemophilus influenzae*. Cystitis is an inflammation of the bladder, usually caused by bacteria. Blepharitis is a chronic inflammation of the eyelids that is caused by a staphylococcus. Dacryocystitis is inflammation of the tear sac, and usually occurs after a long-term obstruction of the nasolacrimal duct and is caused by staphylococci or streptococci. Preseptal cellulitis is inflammation of the tissues around the eye, and Orbital cellulitis is an inflammatory process involving the layer of tissue that separates the eye itself from the eyelid. These life-threatening infections usually arise from staphylococcus. Hence, these types of inflammations are treated with antibiotics. Certain types of anti-inflammatory agents, such as non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medications (Ibuprofen and

Art Unit: 1624

naproxen) along with muscle relaxants can be used in the non-bacterial cases. The above list is by no means complete, but demonstrates the extraordinary breadth of causes, mechanisms and treatment (or lack thereof) for inflammatory disorders. It establishes that it is not reasonable to any agent to be able to treat inflammatory disorders generally.

The diagnosis of each of the disease is generally suggested by medical history and reports of endoscopy, cytology, X-ray, biopsy, etc. depending on the symptoms, signs and complications, which is essential to establish the dosage regimen for appropriate treatment or prevention. The disclosure does not provide any guidance towards the dosage regimen required to facilitate the treatment and/or inhibition of the claimed disorders, nor indicate competent technical references in the appropriate methods.

Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, “the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved”. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). Traxler, in a recent article (Exp. Opin. Ther. Patents, 1997) stated that “The concept of the inhibition of growth factor receptor-mediated signal transduction via inhibition of its protein tyrosine kinase is a novel, **not yet proven** clinical approach to the regulation of cell proliferation.”, see page 585, col. 1. Therefore, the state of the art provides the need of undue experimentation for the instantly claimed therapeutic benefits.

Further, the instant claims are drawn not only to ‘a method of treating’ but also to ‘a **method of preventing**’, for which the specification does not provide sufficient enablement. ‘To

Art Unit: 1624

prevent' actually means *to anticipate or counter in advance, to keep from happening etc.* (as per Webster's II Dictionary) and therefore it is not understood how one skilled in the art can reasonably establish the basis and the type of subject to which the instant compounds can be administered in order to have the recited effect of **prevention**. Based on the inhibitory activity, the instant compounds are disclosed to be useful in the "prevention" of, for example, degenerative disorders, for which applicants provide no competent evidence. It is inconceivable from the *in vitro* data of a small number of representative compounds can be correlated to the "treating or **preventing**" of the various claimed disorders, such that the claimed compounds can not only treat but also "prevent" a myriad of diseases associated with the stated activity. Further, there is no evidence on record which demonstrates that the *in-vitro* screening test relied upon is recognized in the art as being reasonably predictive of success in any of the contemplated areas of "preventing". Such a reasonable correlation is necessary to demonstrate such utilities. See *Ex parte Stevens*, 16 USPQ 2d 1379 (BPAI 1990); *Ex parte Busse et al.*, 1 USPQ 2d 1908 (BPAI 1986) (the evidence must be accepted as "showing" such utility, and not "warranting further study").

Part of the difficulty of developing drugs effective for **preventing** any of the medical conditions such as tumors, CNS disorders, etc. lies in the lack of understanding as to why people come down with these disorders and the numerous causes of these disorders.

(Only a few of the claimed diseases are discussed here to make the point of an insufficient disclosure, it does not definitely mean that the other diseases meet the enablement requirements).

Art Unit: 1624

Thus, factors such as “sufficient working examples”, “the level of skill in the art” and “predictability”, etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the use of the invention. In view of the breadth of the claim, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 and 13-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

1. In claim 1, the term “**comprising**” (all occurrences throughout the claims, see e.g., claim 1, line 7, 16, etc.) is open ended. ‘Comprising’ in a compound claim, leaves the claim open for the inclusion of unspecified groups and/or substituents. The use of the above phrase causes the claim to be broader than the invention. See *In re Fenton*, 451 F.2d 640, 171 USPQ 693 (CCPA 1971).
2. In the claims, the ring member "A" of the aromatic ring is defined as 'C or N', which further contains the substituent R⁹. When 'A is N', it exceeds the available valency number of the nitrogen atom as it already has three bonds due to its presence in the aromatic ring. If it further carries a substituent, the resulting molecule will have a charge.

Art Unit: 1624

The specification does not provide such compounds or any explanation for this embodiment.

3. Claim 9 recites: “The **compound of formula** 2-{5-Chloro-2-[4-(3-methylamino-....”, however, the claim does not contain any 'formula' or refers to any other claim containing the formula. Deletion of the recitation “of formula” from line 1 is suggested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-8, 10-11 and 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pease et al., WO 01/64654. The instant claims read on reference disclosed compounds, see the compounds of structural formula (I) in page 2 and the corresponding species of Example 26, etc. The reference provides a process to prepare the compounds, see for example, process b) in page 14. The reference compounds are taught to be useful as pharmaceutical therapeutic agents, see page 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 1624

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1-11 and 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pease et al., WO 01/64654. The reference teaches a generic group of pyrimidine-2,4-diamine compounds, which embraces applicant's instantly claimed compounds. See formula (I) in page 2, and the corresponding species of, for example, Example No. 26. The compounds are taught to be useful as pharmaceutical agents, see the abstract. Claims 1-8, 10-11 and 13-22 read on reference disclosure as indicated in the 35 USC 102 rejection above. Claim 9 differs from the reference by reciting specific species of the reference genus. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select any of the species of the genus taught by the reference, including those instantly claimed, because the skilled chemist would have the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole i.e., as therapeutic agents. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to

Art Unit: 1624

render prima facie obvious a species falling within a genus. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 847 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

2. Claims 1-11 and 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Baenteli et al., WO 03/078404 (International filing date: March 14, 2003).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

The reference teaches pyrimidine-2,4-diamine compounds that are structurally analogous to instantly claimed compounds. See the compounds of formula (I) in page 1 and the corresponding species disclosed in various tables. The compounds are taught to be useful as

Art Unit: 1624

pharmaceutical agents, see pages 26-28. The instantly claimed compounds require a non-hydrogen substituent at the *ortho* position (or 2-position) of the ring attached to the 2-amino group of the pyrimidine (i.e., in the claims R₁₀ is required to be a non-hydrogen substituent as defined in the claims). The reference discloses pyrimidine compounds which contain substituents at the 3-, 4- and/or 5-positions, see the compounds of the examples. The instant claims differ from the reference compounds by having a substituent at a position different from the reference compounds, i.e., at the 2-position and therefore, the instantly claimed compounds are positional isomers of the reference compounds. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because they are positional isomers of the reference compounds. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because such isomeric compounds are suggestive of one another and would be expected to share similar properties and therefore, the same use as taught for the reference compounds, i.e., as pharmaceutical agents. It has been held that a compound, which is structurally isomeric with a compound of prior art is *prima facie* obvious absent unexpected results. *In re Finley*, 81 USPQ 383 (CCPA 1949); *In re Norris*, 84 USPQ 458 (CCPA 1950); *In re Dillon*, 919 F.2d at 696, 16 USPQ2d at 1904 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Note: Applicant can not rely on the foreign priority date based on the application UK 0305929.2 filed March 14, 2003 to overcome the rejection because the priority document does not fully support the instant claims. For example, the document does not disclose in the structural formula (I) a ring containing the ring member A.

Art Unit: 1624

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1-11 and 13-22 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 4 and 7-9 of copending Application No. 10/507,060. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the applications are drawn to structurally analogous compounds, for example, the instant claims are drawn to compounds that are positional isomers of the compounds of the reference claims (see the explanation under 35 USC 103 rejection above over the corresponding WO document 03/078404). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select any of the compounds from the reference claims and/or use the compounds in any of the methods taught by the reference, including those instantly claimed, because the skilled artisan would have had the

Art Unit: 1624

reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole i.e., as pharmaceutical therapeutic agents. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

2. Claims 1-11 and 13-22 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 23-42 of copending Application No. 10/568,367. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the applications are drawn to structurally analogous compounds. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select any of the compounds from the reference claims and/or use the compounds in any of the methods taught by the reference, including those instantly claimed, because the skilled artisan would have had the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole i.e., as pharmaceutical therapeutic agents. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1624

Receipt is acknowledged of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 13, 2006 and a copy is enclosed herewith.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deepak Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson, can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**/Deepak Rao/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624**

January 28, 2009